



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/717,888	11/20/2003	Thomas R. Haynes	RPS920030178US1	9390
47052 7590 01/31/2007 SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP PO BOX 51418 PALO ALTO, CA 94303			EXAMINER WIENER, ERIC A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2109	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		01/31/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/717,888

Applicant(s)

HAYNES ET AL.

Examiner

Eric A. Wiener

Art Unit

2112

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-59 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-59 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/20/2003.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 59 are pending.
2. The IDS filed on 11/20/2003 has been considered.

Oath/Declaration

3. The oath or declaration is defective, because it does not identify the citizenship of each inventor. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

Specification

4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informality: The sentence starting on line 8 of page 11 refers to “an indicator such as the small triangle shown next to the ‘Modified’ label” in Fig. 1. This is believed to be a typographical error and should probably read “Fig. 2” instead of “Fig. 1.” Appropriate correction is required. If this is not a typographical error, appropriate clarification is required.

Claim Objections

5. The preamble of claim 53 directs itself toward both a system and a method. However, there is no indication that this claimed method is to be implemented on the claimed system. Because this is a “means for” claim, it is believed that the phrase “the method comprising” is a

typographical error and should probably read “the system comprising.” Appropriate correction is required. If this is not a typographical error, appropriate clarification is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1 – 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by De Vorchik et al. (US 6,279,016 B1).

As per claim 1, De Vorchik discloses *a method for using filtering criteria in the display of file objects in a graphical user interface (GUI) (Abstract), the method comprising: receiving user input from a user in the GUI describing one or more filtering criteria for the display of the file objects and filtering the display of the file objects according to the user input* (column 2, lines 55 – 67).

As per claim 2, and taking into account the rejection of claim 1, De Vorchik further discloses that *the user input includes an initial selection by the user of a label object displayed in the GUI and associated with a particular characteristic of the file objects* (column 7, lines 47 – 50).

As per claim 3, and taking into account the rejection of claim 2, De Vorchik further discloses that *a menu including a plurality of items is displayed after the initial selection of the*

label object, wherein each item in the menu describes a filtering criterion (column 9, lines 36 – 51).

As per claim 4, and taking into account the rejection of claim 3, De Vorchik further discloses that *the particular characteristic of the file objects is the type of file objects* (column 7, lines 7 – 20).

As per claim 5, and taking into account the rejection of claim 3, De Vorchik further discloses that *the particular characteristic of the file objects is the size of the file objects* (column 7, lines 7 – 20), wherein the size characteristic of the file objects is disclosed by the fact that “any other data set can be used.”

As per claim 6, and taking into account the rejection of claim 3, De Vorchik further discloses that *the particular characteristic of the file objects is the date the file objects were created* (column 7, lines 7 – 20), wherein the date of creation characteristic of the file objects is disclosed by the fact that “any other data set can be used.”

As per claim 7, and taking into account the rejection of claim 3, De Vorchik further discloses that *the particular characteristic of the file objects is the date the file objects were last modified* (column 7, lines 7 – 20 and column 10, lines 11 – 19).

As per claim 8, and taking into account the rejection of claim 2, De Vorchik further discloses that *an input field is displayed after the initial selection of the label object, wherein the input field is operative to accept text input describing one or more filtering criteria* (column 7, lines 46 – 53).

As per claim 9, and taking into account the rejection of claim 3, De Vorchik further discloses that *an input field is displayed after the initial selection of the label object, the input*

field being operative to accept text input describing one or more filtering criteria (column 7, lines 46 – 53), and wherein the input field displays a text description equivalent to any items of the menu selected by the user (column 10, lines 11 – 18).

As per claim 10, and taking into account the rejection of claim 2, De Vorchik further discloses that *the label object is a column heading object associated with a column in which information concerning a particular file object characteristic is displayed (column 6, lines 46 – 55).*

As per claim 11, and taking into account the rejection of claim 3, De Vorchik further discloses that *the selectable items in the displayed menu are based on the particular label object that was selected (column 10, lines 45 – 58).*

As per claim 12, and taking into account the rejection of claim 11, De Vorchik further discloses that *the items in the menu include a plurality of different ranges of values (column 10, lines 11 – 18).*

As per claim 13, and taking into account the rejection of claim 12, De Vorchik further discloses that *the different ranges in the menu are based on the actual ranges of the associated characteristic of the displayed file objects (column 10, lines 11 – 18).*

As per claim 14, De Vorchik discloses *a method for using filtering criteria in the display of file objects in a graphical user interface (GUI) (Abstract), the method comprising: receiving a selection from a user of a characteristic of the file objects displayed in the GUI, displaying a menu of selectable filtering criteria for the selected characteristic, and filtering the display of the file objects according to the filtering criteria selected by the user as applied to the characteristic of the file objects (column 2, lines 47 – 67).*

As per claim 15, and taking into account the rejection of claim 14, De Vorchik further discloses that *the file objects are displayed in a navigation window of the GUI* (column 7, lines 7 – 9).

As per claim 16, and taking into account the rejection of claim 15, De Vorchik further discloses that *the selection of the characteristic is a selection of a label object labeling the characteristic, and wherein the menu displays the filtering criteria as a plurality of items* (column 10, lines 45 – 58).

As per claim 17, and taking into account the rejection of claim 15; the claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 4.

As per claim 18, and taking into account the rejection of claim 15; the claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 5.

As per claim 19, and taking into account the rejection of claim 15; the claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 6.

As per claim 20, and taking into account the rejection of claim 15; the claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 7.

As per claim 21, and taking into account the rejection of claim 15, De Vorchik further discloses that *the particular characteristic of the file objects is the date the file objects were last accessed* (column 7, lines 7 – 20), wherein the date of last access characteristic of the file objects is disclosed by the fact that “any other data set can be used.”

As per claim 22, and taking into account the rejection of claim 16; the claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 10.

As per claim 23, and taking into account the rejection of claim 15; the claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 11.

As per claim 24, and taking into account the rejection of claim 23; the claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 12.

As per claim 25, and taking into account the rejection of claim 24; the claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 13.

As per claim 26, De Vorchik discloses *a computer readable medium including program instructions to be implemented by a computer, the program instructions allowing filtering criteria to be applied in the display of file objects in a graphical user interface (GUI)* (Abstract and column 19, lines 60 – 63), *the program instructions implementing steps comprising: receiving user input from a user in the GUI describing one or more filtering criteria for the display of the file objects and filtering the display of the file objects according to the user input* (column 2, lines 55 – 67).

As per claim 27, and taking into account the rejection of claim 26; the claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 2.

As per claim 28, and taking into account the rejection of claim 27; the claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 3.

As per claim 29, and taking into account the rejection of claim 28, De Vorchik further discloses that *the particular characteristic of the file objects is one of the following: the type of file objects, the size of the file objects, the date the file objects were created, the date the file objects were last modified, and the date the objects were last accessed* (column 7, lines 7 – 20 and column 10, lines 11 – 19), wherein the size characteristic, date of creation characteristic, and

date of last access characteristic of the file objects are disclosed by the fact that “any other data set can be used.”

As per claim 30, and taking into account the rejection of claim 27; the claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 8.

As per claim 31, and taking into account the rejection of claim 28; the claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 9.

As per claim 32, and taking into account the rejection of claim 27; the claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 10.

As per claim 33, and taking into account the rejection of claim 28; the claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 11.

As per claim 34, and taking into account the rejection of claim 33; the claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 12.

As per claim 35, and taking into account the rejection of claim 34; the claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 13.

As per claim 36, De Vorchik discloses *a system for providing filtering criteria in the display of file objects in a graphical user interface (GUI)* (Abstract and column 20, lines 28 – 29), *the system comprising: a means for receiving user input from a user in the GUI describing one or more filtering criteria for the display of the file objects and a means for filtering the display of the file objects according to the user input* (column 4 line 66 – column 5, line 53), where the means for receiving and filtering are the disclosed computer system, input devices and program modules.

As per claim 37, and taking into account the rejection of claim 36; the claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 2.

As per claim 38, and taking into account the rejection of claim 37; the claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 3.

As per claim 39, and taking into account the rejection of claim 38; the claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 29.

As per claim 40, and taking into account the rejection of claim 37; the claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 8.

As per claim 41, and taking into account the rejection of claim 38; the claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 9.

As per claim 42, and taking into account the rejection of claim 37; the claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 10.

As per claim 43, and taking into account the rejection of claim 38; the claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 11.

As per claim 44, and taking into account the rejection of claim 43; the claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 12.

As per claim 45, and taking into account the rejection of claim 44; the claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 13.

As per claim 46, De Vorchik discloses *a system for providing filtering criteria in the display of file objects in a graphical user interface (GUI)* (Abstract and column 20, lines 28 – 29), *the system comprising: receiving a selection from a user of a characteristic of the file objects displayed in the GUI, displaying a menu of selectable filtering criteria for the selected*

characteristic, the filtering criteria displayed as a plurality of menu items, and filtering the display of the file objects according to the filtering criteria selected by the user as applied to the characteristic of the file objects (column 2, lines 47 – 67).

As per claim 47, and taking into account the rejection of claim 46; the claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 15.

As per claim 48, and taking into account the rejection of claim 47; the claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 29.

As per claim 49, and taking into account the rejection of claim 47; the claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 10.

As per claim 50, and taking into account the rejection of claim 47; the claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 11.

As per claim 51, and taking into account the rejection of claim 50; the claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 12.

As per claim 52, and taking into account the rejection of claim 51; the claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 13.

As per claim 53, De Vorchik discloses *a system for implementing filtering criteria in the display of file objects in a graphical user interface (GUI) (Abstract and column 20, lines 28 – 29), the system comprising: a means for receiving a selection from a user of a characteristic of the file objects displayed in the GUI; a means for displaying a menu of selectable filtering criteria for the selected characteristic, the filtering criteria displayed as a plurality of menu items; and a means for filtering the display of the file objects according to the filtering criteria selected by the user as applied to the characteristic of the file objects (column 4 line 66 – column*

5, line 53), where the means for receiving, displaying, and filtering are the disclosed computer system, input devices, display devices, and program modules.

As per claim 54, and taking into account the rejection of claim 53; the claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 15.

As per claim 55, and taking into account the rejection of claim 54; the claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 29.

As per claim 56, and taking into account the rejection of claim 54; the claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 10.

As per claim 57, and taking into account the rejection of claim 54; the claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 11.

As per claim 58, and taking into account the rejection of claim 57; the claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 12.

As per claim 59, and taking into account the rejection of claim 58; the claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 13.


8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the applicant's disclosure. The cited documents represent the general state of the art.


Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eric A. Wiener whose telephone number is 571-270-1401. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 9am to 4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chameli Das, can be reached on 571-272-3696. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Eric Wiener
Patent Examiner
A.U. 2112


JEANNE CORNELIUS
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART Unit 2162